

Remarks

Claims 19-25 and 39-52 are presented for reconsideration, with claims 19, 39, and 46 being the independent claims. Claims 39-52 are sought to be added. Claims 26-38 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the same or broader claims, with respect to the cancelled claims, in the future.

These amendments should be entered after final, and after filing of the Notice of Appeal, because they place the application in better condition for appeal, as agreed to by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of April 4, 2006. See also M.P.E.P. Section 1206 and 37 C.F.R. Section 41.33(a).

Based on the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding restrictions and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Restriction by Original Presentation

Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments made in the Reply filed March 1, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference.

Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's comments in the final Office Action of December 13, 2005 and the Advisory Action of April 4, 2006, Applicant has cancelled claims 26-38 and added claims 39-52. Accordingly, Applicant believes the restriction asserted against claims 26-38 has been rendered moot.

New claims 39-52 are IDENTICAL to claims 1-14 finally rejected in the final Office Action of April 14, 2005. The addition of claims 39-52 was done to comply with the request by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of April 4, 2006 that the same claims as previously finally rejected be reintroduced into the application for the system claims to be entered for appeal purposes. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner enter this after final Amendment and Reply so that claims 39-52 can be considered on appeal and not assert another restriction requirement against these claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,953,388 to Barada ("Barada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,604,892 to Carraras ("Carraras"), or in the alternative, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,948,082 to Zumbach ("Zumbach"). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barada in view of Carraras in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,317,898 to Nemeth ("Nemeth"), or in the alternative, in view Barada in view Zumbach in further view of Nemeth. Applicant traverses these rejections.

Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments made in the Reply filed March 1, 2006, which are incorporated by reference herein.

New Claims 39-52

As discussed above, Claims 39-52 are IDENTICAL to claims 1-14 pending in the Amendment and Reply of February 28, 2005, which were finally rejected in the final Office Action of April 14, 2005. These claims should be found allowable based at least on the Arguments made in the Reply filed March 1, 2006 and the Arguments made in the Amendment and Reply filed February 28, 2005, which are both incorporated by reference herein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of restriction and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding restrictions and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Joseph H. Lyons
Appl. No. 10/646,720

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 01/8/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
541605.1